



Modelling Illicit Drug Fate in Sewers for Wastewater-Based Epidemiology

Ramin, Pedram; Mikkelsen, Peter Steen; Plósz, Benedek G.

Publication date:
2017

Document Version
Publisher's PDF, also known as Version of record

[Link back to DTU Orbit](#)

Citation (APA):
Ramin, P., Mikkelsen, P. S., & Plósz, B. G. (2017). *Modelling Illicit Drug Fate in Sewers for Wastewater-Based Epidemiology*. Poster session presented at 3rd International conference on "Wastewater – Based Drug Epidemiology", Lisbon, Portugal.

General rights

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the public portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

- Users may download and print one copy of any publication from the public portal for the purpose of private study or research.
- You may not further distribute the material or use it for any profit-making activity or commercial gain
- You may freely distribute the URL identifying the publication in the public portal

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.



The sewer as a bioreactor

Sewer pipelines, although primarily designed for sewage transport, is in fact a bioreactor where the primary substrates (e.g. natural organic fractions) and trace organic substrates (e.g. excreted drug biomarkers) can undergo significant transformation. Hence, the occurrence of illicit drug biomarkers can be potentially influenced by physico-chemical and biological processes (fate processes) in the sewer

Aims

- Providing new evidences on drug transformation and sorption in the sewer
- Predicting the fate processes using mathematical models and statistical analysis
- Primarily focusing on batch experiments representing the sewer as well as preliminary analysis in catchments



Biotransformation (suspended solids)



Fate of the drug biomarkers was assessed using two modelling approaches
I- Describing the biokinetics only for secondary metabolic substances (drug biomarkers) assuming that biomass is constant (based on ASM-X [2])
II- Modelling the primary metabolic processes (related to COD fractions) (based on WATS [3]) combined with secondary metabolic processes (WATS—ASM-X model [1])


- Redox condition has significant impact on biotransformation rates for nearly all selected drugs
- Accounting for biomass growth to estimate biotransformation rate under aerobic conditions is crucial
- Biomass growth do not play a major role in estimation of anaerobic biotransformation rate

Abiotic transformation



$$\frac{dC_{LI}(t)}{dt} = -k_{abio}C_{LI}(t) - k_{des,w}k_{d,w}C_{LI}(t)\frac{A_T(t)}{V_T(t)} + k_{des,w}C_{Sw}(t)$$


Abiotic transformation Sorption to reactor wall Desorption from reactor wall



- Experiments were performed with mineral water
- First order equation was used for predictions
- Abiotic transformation is significant (>1 d⁻¹) for many of the compounds specially for COC, CE, THC, THCOH and THCCOOH
- No major difference was found between aerobic and anaerobic abiotic transformation except for COE and NCOE [1]

C_{LI}	Dissolved trace organic chemical	mg L ⁻¹
C_{Sw}	Trace organic chemical onto tank wall	mg L ⁻¹
$k_{des,w}$	Desorption from reactor wall	d ⁻¹
$k_{d,w}$	Reactor wall-liquid partition coefficient	L dm ⁻²
k_{abio}	Abiotic transformation rate constant	d ⁻¹
A_T	Area of liquid in external tank	dm ²
V_T	Volume of liquid in external tank	L

Sorption (biofilm)




$$K_{df} = \frac{C_{SL,eq} - C_{loss}}{(C_{LI,eq} + C_{loss})X_{SS}}$$

$$C_{loss} = C_{LI,t=0} - C_{LI,t=end}$$

Compound	K_{df} (L g ⁻¹) aerobic	K_{df} (L g ⁻¹) anaerobic
MEPPH	0.2	0
METD	0.32	0.55
EDDP	0	0.15
BE	0.9	0.62
EME	0	1.59
THCOH	2.81	1.68
THCCOOH	0	1.06

- Sorption tests were performed with suspended biofilm [4]
- Sorption to biofilm was observed for few compounds

Sorption (suspended solids)




$$K_d = \frac{C_{SL,eq} - C_{loss}}{(C_{LI,eq} + C_{loss})X_{SS}}$$

$$C_{loss} = C_{LI,t=0} - C_{LI,t=end}$$

Compound	K_d (L g ⁻¹)
MEPPH	0.25
EDDP	0.03
6MAM	0.31
NCOE	0.01
THCOH	0.75
THCCOOH	0.8


- Sorption tests were performed with washed-off diluted primary sludge [1]
- Sorption to reactor wall and hydrolysis (loss) were accounted for in calculation of k_d using blank experiments
- Sorption to suspended solids was found to be relevant for a few compounds
- THC was found to completely sorped to reactor wall

Biotransformation (biofilm)



- Abiotic transformation: $-k_{abio}C_{LI}(t)$
- Biotransformation and sorption (suspended solids): $-\frac{k_{bio}X_{SS}}{1 + K_dX_{SS}}C_{LI}(t)$
- Biotransformation and sorption (biofilm): $-\frac{k_{bio}X_{SS}}{1 + K_dX_{SS}}C_{LI}(t)$
- Sorption-desorption to wall: $-k_{des,w}k_{d,w}C_{LI}(t)\frac{A_T(t)}{V_T(t)} + k_{des,w}C_{Sw}(t)$

- In external tank: 1+2+4
- In reactor bulk: 1+2
- In Biofilm: 1+3




- Biofilms were established in rotating reactors after 7 month continuous feeding with wastewater
- A 1-D multi-compartment model was built to describe spatial and temporal variations inside the biofilm
- Mass transfer limitation from bulk phase to biofilm was considered
- Diffusive boundary layer and number of discretization were carefully assigned [4]

Final remarks

- Through different experimental assessments, it was found that drug biomarkers can potentially undergo significant sorption and transformation in the sewers
- Sorption and transformation rates are the key indicators of *drug stability* in the sewer which can be estimated using mathematical models and statistical analysis
- In the sewer, different drug biomarkers can transform to each other, hence pathway identification is crucial when modelling transformations [6]
- Ignoring in-sewer fate processes for drug biomarkers can be a significant source of bias for wastewater-based epidemiology

Drug biomarkers loss in three hypothetical catchments (simulation study) [5]

- A: 10000 PE, HRT=1.4 h
- B: 50000 PE, HRT=2.8 h
- C: 200000 PE, HRT=5.5 h



We acknowledge all SEWPROF members, specially our collaborators and coauthors that made this study possible: Fabio Polesel, Andreas Libonati Brock, Pim de Voogt, Ana Causanilles, Borja Valverde-Pérez, Erik Emke and Luca Vezzaro